A.   Claim 1

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference. For example, claim 1 recites a printer having a configuration file generator for employing print setup information in the document file, which is received from the computer. The configuration file generator generates a configuration file concerning a print setup for the document file. Further, claim 1 recites a print setup reference means for employing the configuration file to generate a menu indicating contents of the print setup. The menu is transmitted from the printer to a computer via a transfer means.

The Examiner maintains that Edwards discloses the above features. In particular, the Examiner maintains that the Emulation Manager Task 36 ("Task 36") discloses the claimed configuration file generation means, as well as the claimed print setup reference means (col. 6, lines 47-48). Therefore, Applicant assumes that the Examiner maintains that the "job structure" of Edwards discloses the claimed generation file. For example, the reference discloses that the Task 36 and a Data Stream Manager 34 associate a "job structure" with each print job, where the "job structure" includes information related to the print job (col. 6, lines 52-58).

However, even if Applicant assumes *arguendo* that Task 36 discloses the claimed configuration file generation means and the claimed print setup reference means, and the "job structure" discloses the claimed configuration file, it appears that the reference fails to disclose that Task 36 employs the "job structure" to generate a menu which indicates the contents of the "job structure", as recited in claim 1. Since the reference does not disclose that the Task 36

generates a menu, the reference likewise fails to disclose that the menu is transmitted to a

computer (i.e. a host), as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 further recites a printing means that prints a document file in accordance with the

configuration file.

Referring to Applicant's comments above, the Examiner maintains that Task 36 discloses

the claimed configuration file generation means and the print setup reference means. Also, as

stated above, Applicant assumes that the Examiner maintains that the "job structure" discloses

the claimed configuration file. However, even by assuming *arguendo* that Applicant's

assumptions are accurate, Edwards still fails to disclose the claimed print means. For example,

the reference discloses that the Task 36 cooperates with a Data Stream Manager 34 to route

appropriate print jobs to selected interpreters (col. 6, lines 61-63). Once an interpreter is finished

with a print job, an indication is sent to the Task 36, and the interpreted print jobs are sent to

software and print mechanism software to be further processed and printed (col. 6, line 64 to col.

7, line 12).

When the Task 36 receives the indication that the interpreter is finished with the print job,

the Task 36 is then able to modify the "job structure" (col. 7, lines 1-3). However, since

modification of the "job structure" is performed in the Task 36, and the "job structure" is not

modified until the interpreter sends an indication to the Task 36, it appears that the "job

structure" is never sent to the interpreter for generation of interpreted print jobs. Accordingly,

since it is the "interpreted print jobs" that are sent for further processing and printing, and the

interpreted print jobs do not appear to contain the "job structure", Applicant submits that the

interpreted print job is not printed in accordance with the "job structure", as recited in claim 1.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited

reference, and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

B.   Claims 4, 5, 8, and 12-18

Since claims 4, 5, 8 and 12-18 contains features that are analogous to the features recited

in claim 1, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable for at least analogous reasons as

presented above.

C.   Claims 2, 3, 6, 7 and 9-11

Since claims 2, 3, 6, 7 and 9-11 are dependent on one of claims 1, 4, 5, 8 or 12-18,

Applicant submits that such claims are patentable over the cited reference at least by virtue of

their dependency.

II.   Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.